

OPINION 1350

CONUS ANTIQUUS LAMARCK, 1810 (MOLLUSCA,
GASTROPODA): NEOTYPE SUPPRESSED

RULING — (1) The neotype designation of *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 made by Hall, 1964, *Boll. soc. paleont. ital.*, vol. 3, p. 129 is hereby suppressed.

(2) The specific name *antiquus* Lamarck, 1810, as published in the binomen *Conus antiquus* and as defined by the lectotype here designated, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3015.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2325

A request for the suppression of the neotype designation of *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 as a result of a rediscovered original specimen was first received from Dr A. J. Kohn (*University of Washington, U.S.A.*) on 22 October 1979. Due to the financial position of the Commission at the time, the application was not sent to the printers until 11 May 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 283–284. No plenary powers were involved and no comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)16 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 283–284. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Dupuis

Negative Votes — two (2) received in the following order: Bernardi, Ride.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Bernardi: 'Je ne suis pas persuadé que la "procédure" proposée soit utile. Le néotype créé en 1964 par Hall semble remplir parfaitement son rôle de "support du nom". Ceci pose, comme pour l'Opinion 1346, un problème général: faut-il supprimer un néotype simplement parce que la série typique est redécouverte? A mon avis *non*, si cette activité n'apporte aucune précision taxonomique. Revalider sans raison taxonomique une série typique relève plus du "culte" des types que de la recherche scientifique si un

néotype existe déjà.' [Article 75h gives the Commission the choice between confirming the neotype or validating the rediscovered type in such cases. Secretary].

Ride: 'My affirmative vote for a ruling "that the neotype . . . is not to be retained as a name-bearing type" (worded to conform with the 3rd Edn. Art. 75h) is conditional upon the Secretary confirming that the locality, horizon, etc., of the rediscovered syntype are sufficient for it to be useful'. [Monsieur B. Métivier of the *Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris* was contacted and asked for information concerning the type locality of the lectotype. Monsieur Métivier replied to the effect that the type locality was 'cône du Piémont'. Dr Ride's vote was thus changed to a negative one].

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following is the original reference for the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
antiquus, Conus, Lamarck, 1810, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat.*, vol. 15, p. 439.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1350.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

20 May 1985